

DATE: February 10, 2009

TO: SANBAG Board of Directors

FROM: Ty Schuiling, Director of Planning and Programming

SUBJECT: Background material for the February 17 Board Workshop on the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan

This memorandum transmits the attached member agency comments and staff responses on the draft Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan to the SANBAG Board of Directors in advance of the Strategic Plan workshop scheduled for February 17, 2009.

The draft Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan was released for formal review and comment with the mailing of the December 2008 SANBAG committee agendas. The draft was also mailed to city managers, Caltrans, and transit agencies on December 5. The closing date for comments was January 21, 2009. The final Strategic Plan Report will be prepared for March committee review, with SANBAG Board approval scheduled for April 1, 2009.

Ten jurisdictions and two transit agencies provided written comments on the draft Strategic Plan. SANBAG staff has completed responses to those comments, provided in Attachment 1 to this memorandum. Attachment 1 repeats the jurisdiction comments and provides the corresponding SANBAG response. The comments are identified by a jurisdiction code and comment number for easy cross-referencing. Copies of the complete comment letters or e-mails sent to SANBAG are provided as Attachment 2. This information was also provided to the Comprehensive Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee (CTP TAC), and a discussion of the comments and responses was held with technical staff at the TAC meeting on February 9.

SANBAG staff began responding to comments as the letters were received. Because of this and the need to cross-reference the comments, the comments and responses in Attachment 1 are not in alphabetical order by jurisdiction. Board members can find the comments from a specific jurisdiction as follows, within Attachment 1:

- City of Fontana, starting on Page 1
- City of Rancho Cucamonga, Page 5
- City of Yucaipa, Page 8
- City of Ontario, Page 9
- City of Grand Terrace, Page 12
- City of San Bernardino City, Page 15
- County of San Bernardino, Page 16
- City of Highland, Page 40
- Victor Valley Transit Agency, Page 49
- Omnitrans, Page 51

- City of Victorville, Page 51
- City of Big Bear Lake, Page 56

At the workshop, SANBAG staff will review the comments and staff responses, as summarized below, and will be prepared to discuss individual issues in detail to the degree desired by Board members. The recurring comment “themes” are summarized below, accompanied by locations in Attachment 1 where the specific comments and responses may be found. The summary below is not intended to be comprehensive, but is intended to highlight for Board members the types of concerns expressed by jurisdictions.

- Overarching comment themes:
 - What guarantees are in place that each program will receive its prescribed share of Measure I funds? (see response to comments SBC-03 and SBC-18)
 - There is a need to further streamline the administrative processes for reimbursement programs (see response to comment SBC-01, part a)
 - Provisions need to be made for advancement of reimbursements rather than the proposed monthly reimbursement (see response to comment SBC-01, part b)
 - Expenditures that occurred prior to April 5, 2006 should be allowable for Project Advancement or Advance Expenditure Agreements. (see response to comment FO-02 and RC-01)
 - RDA funds should be allowed to be used for local development share (see response to comment VV-01)
- Valley Freeway Interchange Program comment themes:
 - Language should be included to address the scenario whereby a minority share agency is unwilling or unable to be a part to the Funding Agreement. (see response to comment FO-01)
 - SANBAG should provide loans to cover the cost of minor partners, and collect repayment for loans to minor partners from future Measure I 2010-2040 funds (see response to comment RC-02)
 - Proposed terms of fair share loans need to be relaxed in the event development does not occur to the extent anticipated (see response to comment SBC-38)
 - The Project Funding Agreement for one phase of a project should only require the local jurisdiction to commit to providing the development share for the same phase, but not for all phases of the project (see response to comment HI-20)
- Valley Major Street Program comment themes:
 - What protections are in place to ensure that each jurisdiction receives its equitable share? (see response to comment GT-01)
- Express Bus/BRT program comment samples:
 - Ongoing maintenance of BRT dedicated guideways should be allowable reimbursable expenses under this program (see response to comment SB-01)
- Mountain/Desert Major Local Highways Program comment themes:
 - Development shares should not be required on projects in the Local Streets pass-through program for the Victor Valley (SBC-02)
 - Why is the CPNA required, and how can it be simplified? (SBC-01, part a)

In addition to these themes, comments were received for clarification of language or other editorial corrections. SANBAG staff's responses attempted, where possible, to accommodate requests from jurisdictions to modify specific policies contained in the draft Strategic Plan, so long as this was consistent with the Measure I Ordinance, existing SANBAG policy, and direction provided by the SANBAG Board and its committees. Some policy wording changes are proposed in response to jurisdiction comments. However, SANBAG staff also chose to sustain existing Strategic Plan language in some cases, particularly on issues of SANBAG's fiduciary responsibility as overseer of Measure I sales tax dollars, on maintenance of inter-jurisdictional equity, on ensuring that Measure I funds do not pay costs required to be borne by development, and on maximizing delivery of projects, whether they are managed by SANBAG or its member agencies.

Staff looks forward to a fruitful discussion on how the Measure I policies can achieve this objective. Please remember to bring your copy of the Draft Strategic Plan to the meeting with you in the event it is necessary to refer to it during the discussion.